

BLACKS IN NEW JERSEY - 1983

Perspectives on Mount Laurel II

Fourth Annual Report of the New Jersey  
Public Policy Research Institute

BLACKS IN NEW JERSEY - 1983

Perspectives on Mount Laurel II

Fourth Annual Report of the New Jersey  
Public Policy Research Institute

September, 1983

NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY

## NEW JERSEY PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute (NJPPRI), established in 1978, is a volunteer, non-profit, tax exempt organization. The Institute is concerned with identifying, analyzing and promulgating public policy issues significantly affecting the black residents of New Jersey. Further, the organization seeks to present these issues for appropriate public discussion. Through public discussion, the Institute contributes to the development of strategies that address these issues in ways beneficial to the State's Black population.

The Institute is state-wide in focus and attempts to work cooperatively with public policy oriented individuals and organizations throughout New Jersey.

### Officers

Jerome C. Harris, President  
Richard W. Roper, Vice President  
Douglas Morgan, Treasurer  
Robert Taliaferro, Corresponding Secretary

### Mailing Address

260 Park Avenue  
Piscataway, NJ 08854

NEW JERSEY PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE BOARD OF  
DIRECTORS

Beverly L. Ballard  
Gustav Heningsburg  
Associates  
Newark, NJ

Alice Barnett  
Mini-Surgi Site  
Newark, NJ

Charles Chapman  
Consultant  
Washington, D.C.

Vicki Donaldson  
Attorney  
East Orange, NJ

George Hampton  
University of Medicine and  
Dentistry  
Newark, NJ

Jerome Harris  
Deputy City Administrator  
Plainfield, NJ

Gilbert H. Hatcher  
Resorts International  
Atlantic City, NJ

Robert Holmes  
Newark Watershed Corp.  
Newark, NJ

Regina W. Joseph  
The Business Employment  
Foundation  
Paterson, NJ

Vivian King  
Seton Hall Law School  
South Orange, NJ

Lorenzo Littles  
Attorney  
Chicago, Ill.

Gwendolyn I. Long  
Division of Youth and  
Family Services  
Newark, NJ

Douglas Morgan  
Robert Wood Johnson  
Foundation  
Princeton, NJ

William Phillips, III  
U.S. State Department  
New Delhi, India

Oliver B. Quinn  
Urban League of Essex  
County  
Newark, NJ

Bruce Ransom  
Department of Politics  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ

Patricia Robinson  
Department of Health and  
Welfare  
Newark, NJ

Richard W. Roper  
Woodrow Wilson School  
Princeton University  
Princeton, NJ

Sam Shepherd  
Port Authority of New York  
and New Jersey  
New York, NY

Warren Smith  
Engelhard Corporation  
Iselin, NJ

Gregory Stewart  
Attorney  
Washington, DC

Robert Taliaferro  
Human Resources Admin.  
New York, NY

## SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute wishes to thank the firms listed below for their generous financial contribution supporting the publication of this fourth annual report. We believe the Blacks in New Jersey report series contributes, in a constructive way, to the discussion of important issues of public policy in our state. The response to our efforts by these minority firms suggests that they concur. We deeply appreciate their support.

C.H. Sanders Construction Corporation  
40 Clinton Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Dunn and Sons Maintenance Corporation  
912 South Avenue  
Plainfield, New Jersey 07060

Nelson Peters and Associates  
1501 South Second Street  
Plainfield, New Jersey 07060

Evan Bow Construction Company  
586 Central Avenue  
East Orange, New Jersey 07018

J. Henderson and Sons, Inc.  
T/A McDonalds of Plainfield  
234-246 East Front Street  
Plainfield, New Jersey 07060

## ESSAY COMPETITION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

During 1984, New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute will initiate "a call for papers" prepared by New Jersey high school juniors and seniors, by students enrolled in New Jersey colleges and universities and by New Jersey residents enrolled in undergraduate and graduates schools anywhere in the nation.

High school students will be invited to submit an essay on the meaning and significance of the philosophy and ideals of a black person in New Jersey's history, whose insights about the struggle of blacks in New Jersey contain lessons for us today.

College undergraduate and graduate students will be invited to submit a rigorous and systematic investigation of problems and issues, especially political and economic ones, confronting blacks in New Jersey. The paper should identify and assess the strategies and tactics deemed useful for pursuing public policy and private sector goals that will resolve the problems investigated.

Scholarship awards will be made to the best three papers in each of the above described categories.

For further details inquiries should be addressed to the attention of Dr. Bruce Ransom or Ms. Regina W. Joseph, NJPPRI, 260 Park Avenue, Piscataway, NJ 08854.

## CONTENTS

|   | <u>page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| PREFACE . . . . .   | 1           |
| COMMUNITY INDEX - 1983 . . . . .  | 3           |
| Population by Age . . . . .   | 4           |
| Household Relationship . . . . .  | 5           |
| Income . . . . .  | 5           |
| Black Births . . . . .  | 6           |
| Public School Enrollment & Other Statistics . . . . .                     | 6           |
| MOUNT LAUREL II -- A BRIEF DESCRIPTION . . . . .                          | 16          |
| MOUNT LAUREL II: A BLACK LAWYER'S PERSPECTIVE . . . . .                   | 20          |
| BLACK POPULATION TRENDS AND THEIR POLITICAL<br>SIGNIFICANCE . . . . .     | 30          |
| Black Dispersal and Clustering . . . . .                                  | 32          |
| Black Population Distribution and the Black Political Base . . . . .      | 34          |
| Conclusions . . . . .   | 42          |
| HOUSING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BLACKS: ACCESS TO<br>THE SUBURBS . . . . . | 45          |
| Background . . . . .  | 45          |
| Anti-Discrimination Laws . . . . .  | 46          |
| Opening the Door to New Jersey's Suburbs . . . . .                        | 47          |
| Enforcement of Fair Housing Laws . . . . .                                | 49          |
| Is Mount Laurel II the Answer? . . . . .                                  | 49          |
| A COMMUNITY REMEMBERS . . . . .   | 51          |
| Moorestown . . . . .  | 52          |
| Mount Laurel . . . . .  | 57          |
| Some Final Thoughts . . . . .   | 62          |
| CRITICAL ISSUES FOR BLACKS . . . . .                                      | 68          |
| Low Income Housing Requires Public Subsidy . . . . .                      | 69          |
| Planning Takes Center Stage . . . . .                                     | 70          |
| Creaming and Dispersal . . . . .  | 72          |

## PREFACE

This fourth annual report of the New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute differs in a number of ways from the Institute's three preceding reports. In this edition of "Blacks in New Jersey," the contributors focus on a single public policy issue. Additionally, this report employs the use of personal retrospection in an attempt to insure that the abstract policy consideration is laid against the human condition that gave rise to it. Finally, this report differs from its antecedents in that it seeks to place in the public record informed black perspectives on an important issue of public policy as that issue is being debated throughout New Jersey.

The Supreme Court of this state, in a unanimous decision, Southern Burlington County NAACP v. Township of Mt. Laurel (N.J. Jan. 20, 1983), has for the second time declared that no developing community can evade its responsibility to provide affordable housing for low and moderate income residents. The nature of local responses to this directive is a concern to many, not only in New Jersey, but across the nation. The responses are of particular concern to New Jersey's low and moderate income residents who, it is hoped, will benefit from affirmative responses to the directive. It is also a major concern of individuals and organizations dedicated to improving the quality of life for New Jersey's minority residents, many of whom fall within the low and moderate income group.



Given the critical need for affordable housing in New Jersey, the interests of many groups converge in a discussion of the Mount Laurel II decision. The membership of NJPPRI believes it is important that blacks in New Jersey be aware of the decision's significance and contribute to the debate affecting its implementation.

This report is an initial step in furtherance of these objectives. In the pages following the Community Index, we offer some thoughts as to the prospects for blacks gaining access to low and moderate income housing that may be built as a result of the Mount Laurel II decision. In reviewing the data related to the proportion of the state's population that is black and meet the low and moderate income criteria, Bob Holmes speculates about the possibility of blacks not benefitting from the decision. Bruce Ransom responds to the frequently raised issue of the political implications of increased black dispersal the decision could produce. Lee Porter offers insights into the current difficulties faced by blacks seeking housing in the suburbs. Regina Joseph gives us a sense of the black historical experience in the Mount Laurel area. And finally, there is discussion of several issues about which black New Jerseyans should be aware.

Richard W. Roper  
Editor

## COMMUNITY INDEX - 1983

The New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute's third annual report, Blacks in New Jersey: 1982, presented the most recent statewide statistics then available on the composition of the black community. This brief narrative and accompanying tables present county-level statistics by age, household relationship, and one indicator of socioeconomic status, income. A data presentation on education of persons 25 years of age and older is also provided as information.

The data were compiled from 1980 census tables, by county, obtained from the State Data Center. The total number of blacks on which the data are based is 924,909, compared with the earlier preliminary estimates of 924,786. In order to provide both clarity and an opportunity to address county-level policy concerns, each table is presented in terms of row percent distributions and column percents. Where appropriate, areas of policy concern are highlighted.

In addition, data on births by race for 1981, obtained from the New Jersey Department of Health, are presented. A brief narrative of the findings is also provided.

Finally, in the interest of space, neither data from the 1970 census nor 1980 birth statistics are presented. The reader is asked to refer to other documents, including Blacks in New Jersey: 1982, for these data.

## POPULATION BY AGE

The black population in New Jersey is young. Nearly nine percent of all blacks in the state are under 5 years of age, and 20 percent are between the ages of 5 and 14. Comparable figures for whites are, respectively, 6 and 14 percent. The largest proportion of children is found in Essex County, which is understandable, since it has the largest proportion of black residents in the state.

With few exceptions, county-level analysis reveals that the distribution of young children approaches or exceeds the state average for all blacks. In fact, eight of the 21 counties -- Camden, Cumberland, Essex, Hudson, Ocean, Passaic, Somerset, and Warren -- exceed the already high statewide proportion for children under the age of 14.

At the individual (micro) level, the presence of many children might mean delaying the purchase of desired household goods or prevent the acquisition of adequate savings. However, at the macro level, the presence of children, especially those not yet school age, require that a host of community services be made available. These include, but are not limited to, day care facilities for working parents and adequate and convenient access to health care.

Clearly, the majority of New Jersey counties need to examine what effect the age distribution has and will have on community resources. Further, an understanding of the extent of unmet need for services should be within the purview of policy makers at the municipal, county and state levels.

## HOUSEHOLD RELATIONSHIP

Forty percent of all black households in New Jersey are headed by women. Statewide, nearly 30 percent of female headed black households include children. Comparable statewide proportions are 16 and 9 percent, respectively. As shown in Table 2, two counties, Passaic and Hudson, have the largest proportion of their households headed by women (respectively 36 and 37 percent).

Household formation is important in as much as it focuses upon areas of need. One can not assume, a priori, that all households made up of married couples live within a certain income level or have otherwise achieved a particular standard of living. Aggregate statistics such as these preclude any such conclusions from being drawn. However, the fact that a highly significant proportion of the black community in the state live in households where the major breadwinner is a woman (and it has been documented that the need for family services increases as the proportion of non-married women with children increases), should be the cause for great concern.

## INCOME

In 1979, 36 percent of black families had incomes below \$10,000. Less than three percent of black families statewide had 1979 incomes of \$50,000 or more. If we designate incomes below \$10,000 (regardless of family size) to indicate either poverty level or working poor, at least seven of the 21 counties have proportions of the black community within this designation which exceed the proportion statewide. For example, Passaic County has nearly 44 percent of black families in this category and Hudson, nearly 43 percent (Table 3).

## BLACK BIRTHS

The number of births to black women decreased three percent between 1980 and 1981. As part of the decline, births to black women under age 20 went from 5,240 in 1980 to 4,882 in 1981, a decrease of seven percent. However, blacks continue to account for the majority of births to women under age 16. Specifically, blacks account for 71 percent of all births to teenagers 14 years of age or younger, 61 percent of births to 15 year olds, and 53 percent of births to young mothers who were 16 (Table 4).

## PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT & OTHER STATISTICS

The number of black children enrolled in New Jersey's public schools in grades pre-kindergarten through 12 has decreased nearly 4 percent in three years, from 223,568 in 1980 to 215,171 in 1982. However, since total system-wide enrollment has declined, most notably among whites, the proportion of blacks has increased from 17.9 percent in 1980 to 18.4 percent in 1982 (Table 5).

As seen in Table 7, the number of black students who were reported as dropouts declined by more than 7 percent between 1979 and 1981. However, black students who dropped out of public schools continue to represent more than their proportional share of students enrolled. Specifically, 26.4 percent of the students who were enrolled in school in the fall of 1979 and who dropped out of school during the year were black. In 1980 the proportion was 26.2 percent who dropped out and in 1981, 28 percent. Where in the educational process are these dropouts occurring? This question could not be addressed with the data which

were readily available from the Department of Education. However, an analysis of this question should be a high priority since the implications of such patterns for blacks in the educational process are enormous.

---

New Jersey Department of Education data are for the previous school year.

Table 1

Black Population by Age Group and County  
(Column Percents)

|             | Population | <u>Distribution by Age Group</u> |         |         |        | 65 and over |
|-------------|------------|----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------------|
|             |            | Under 5 Years                    | 5-14    | 15-59   | 60-64  |             |
| State Total | 924,909    | 79,093                           | 187,328 | 572,840 | 29,011 | 16.2        |
| Atlantic    | 3.7        | 3.2                              | 3.6     | 3.4     | 4.3    | 7.1         |
| Bergen      | 3.6        | 2.4                              | 2.9     | 3.8     | 4.2    | 6.0         |
| Burlington  | 4.9        | 4.6                              | 4.8     | 5.3     | 3.4    | 6.1         |
| Camden      | 7.3        | 8.6                              | 7.5     | 7.0     | 7.4    | 10.1        |
| Cape May    | .6         | 0.6                              | 0.5     | 0.5     | .9     | 1.0         |
| Cumberland  | 2.1        | 2.5                              | 2.4     | 2.0     | 2.1    | 2.1         |
| Essex       | 34.2       | 35.1                             | 34.0    | 34.2    | 34.9   | 34.2        |
| Gloucester  | 1.8        | 1.6                              | 1.6     | 1.8     | 2.9    | 2.7         |
| Hudson      | 7.6        | 8.3                              | 8.0     | 7.4     | 6.2    | 6.5         |
| Hunterdon   | 0.1        | .2                               | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1    | 0.2         |
| Mercer      | 6.0        | 6.0                              | 5.8     | 6.0     | 6.7    | 6.1         |
| Middlesex   | 3.9        | 3.4                              | 3.5     | 4.2     | 3.5    | 2.8         |
| Monmouth    | 4.6        | 4.2                              | 4.6     | 4.5     | 5.7    | 5.2         |
| Morris      | 1.1        | 1.0                              | 1.0     | 1.2     | 0.8    | 1.0         |
| Ocean       | 1.0        | 1.1                              | 1.2     | 1.0     | 0.8    | 1.0         |
| Passaic     | 6.5        | 7.0                              | 7.5     | 6.3     | 4.9    | 4.2         |
| Salem       | 1.0        | 1.0                              | 1.0     | 1.0     | 1.5    | 1.5         |
| Somerset    | 1.0        | 1.0                              | 1.2     | 1.1     | 0.8    | 0.8         |
| Sussex      | 0.1        | 0.1                              | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0      | 0.1         |
| Union       | 8.8        | 8.2                              | 8.6     | 9.0     | 8.4    | 8.2         |
| Warren      | 0.1        | 0.1                              | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0      | 0.1         |

Column Percents refers to a comparison between counties; the total of all county percent figures equal 100.

Table 2

Black by Household Type & Family Type by Presence of Children by County  
Row Percents

|                          | <u>Married Couple</u> |                | <u>Male Headed</u> |                | <u>Female Headed</u> |                |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|                          | <u>With</u>           | <u>Without</u> | <u>With</u>        | <u>Without</u> | <u>With</u>          | <u>Without</u> |
| State Total<br>(6,479)   | 32.0                  | 22.3           | 2.6                | 3.0            | 29.6                 | 1.0            |
| Alameda<br>(817)         | 26.0                  | 23.5           | 3.1                | 3.0            | 29.4                 | 1.1            |
| Berkeley<br>(8,135)      | 37.2                  | 31.9           | 2.1                | 2.2            | 17.2                 | 9.4            |
| Burlington<br>(10,484)   | 49.1                  | 24.1           | 2.6                | 1.9            | 16.6                 | 5.7            |
| Contra Costa<br>(15,905) | 29.8                  | 20.4           | 2.9                | 3.3            | 32.0                 | 11.6           |
| East Bay<br>(1,125)      | 36.2                  | 26.1           | 0.0                | 4.4            | 22.3                 | 11.0           |
| Contra Costa<br>(4,305)  | 31.7                  | 22.4           | 3.9                | 2.5            | 31.0                 | 8              |
| Alameda<br>(74,590)      | 27.5                  | 20.7           | 2.8                | 3.3            | 34.4                 | 11.3           |
| Gloucester<br>(4,298)    | 35.2                  | 33.0           | 2.6                | 2.3            | 17.3                 | 9.6            |
| Alameda<br>(16,229)      | 29.0                  | 19.2           | 2.6                | 3.0            | 35.3                 | 10.7           |
| Alameda<br>(120)         | 42.5                  | 37.5           | 0.0                | 2.5            |                      | 10.0           |
| Alameda<br>(12,693)      | 29.9                  | 21.5           | 2.0                | 2.5            | 33.3                 | 10.8           |
| Middlesex<br>(7,949)     | 38.9                  | 25.3           | 2.6                | 2.9            | 22.7                 | 7.6            |
| Monmouth<br>(10,060)     | 33.5                  | 25.1           | 2.1                | 2.2            | 25.4                 | 11.7           |
| Morris<br>(2,376)        | 40.8                  | 22.6           | 3.6                | 3.1            | 19.5                 | 10.4           |
| Ocean<br>(2,146)         | 41.6                  | 21.2           | 2.0                | 2.3            | 24.1                 | 8.8            |

Row Percents refers to the distribution of the population within the county.



Black by Household Type & Family Type by Presence of Children by County  
(Row Percents)

|                     | <u>Married Couple</u> |                | <u>Male Headed</u> |                | <u>Female Headed</u> |                |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|                     | <u>With</u>           | <u>Without</u> | <u>With</u>        | <u>Without</u> | <u>With</u>          | <u>Without</u> |
| Passaic<br>(13,722) | 31.3                  | 15.9           | 2.6                | 2.7            | 37.3                 | 10.2           |
| Salem<br>(2,276)    | 29.8                  | 25.8           | 3.9                | 4.4            | 26.4                 | 10.7           |
| Somerset<br>(2,330) | 47.6                  | 24.8           | 2.7                | 1.8            | 14.6                 | 8.5            |
| Sussex<br>(136)     | 66.1                  | 23.5           | 2.9                | 0.0            | 7.5                  | 0.0            |
| Union<br>(19,354)   | 38.9                  | 26.3           | 2.1                | 3.4            | 19.8                 | 9.1            |
| Warren<br>(229)     | 36.6                  | 24.5           | 0.0                | 7.4            | 23.6                 | 7.9            |

Table 3

Income of Black Families, 1979 by County  
(Row Percentages)

|             | TOTAL   | Less Than<br>\$5,000 | \$5,000 to<br>\$7,499 | \$7,500 to<br>\$9,999 | \$10,000 to<br>\$14,999 | \$15,000 to<br>\$19,999 | \$20,000 to<br>\$24,999 | \$25,000 to<br>\$34,999 | \$35,000 to<br>\$49,999 | \$50,000<br>or more |
|-------------|---------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| State Total | 216,479 | 17.2                 | 9.5                   | 8.9                   | 15.8                    | 13.3                    | 11.1                    | 14.3                    | 7.4                     | 2.3                 |
| Alameda     | 7,817   | 13.7                 | 12.3                  | 9.6                   | 19.6                    | 14.1                    | 9.9                     | 12.9                    | 5.4                     | 2                   |
| Berkeley    | 8,338   | 6.9                  | 9.4                   | 7.2                   | 12.8                    | 12.1                    | 13.1                    | 22.1                    | 13.8                    | 6.1                 |
| Burlington  | 10,484  | 7.4                  | 6.0                   | 8.0                   | 15.0                    | 14.2                    | 13.7                    | 20.3                    | 11.8                    | 3.4                 |
| Candem      | 15,905  | 11.0                 | 8.5                   | 8.4                   | 17.5                    | 13.2                    | 10.5                    | 12.3                    | 5.9                     | 4                   |
| Cape May    | 1,125   | 12.0                 | 7.7                   | 14.8                  | 18.6                    | 16.0                    | 14.1                    | 9.2                     | 5.0                     | 1.4                 |
| Chamberland | 4,305   | 16.7                 | 10.2                  | 12.3                  | 18.0                    | 13.9                    | 11.1                    | 11.6                    | 3.9                     | 3                   |
| Essex       | 74,590  | 21.1                 | 10.2                  | 9.7                   | 18.1                    | 12.6                    | 10.0                    | 12.4                    | 5.9                     | 2                   |
| Gloucester  | 4,298   | 12.4                 | 6.9                   | 8.1                   | 17.1                    | 12.5                    | 14.6                    | 12.4                    | 8.7                     | 4                   |
| Hudson      | 16,229  | 22.4                 | 10.9                  | 9.3                   | 15.8                    | 13.8                    | 9.2                     | 12.3                    | 4.6                     | 4                   |
| Santerdon   | 16,229  | 7.5                  | 26.7                  | 5.8                   | 6.7                     | 15.8                    | 15.8                    | 6.7                     | 0.0                     | 15.0                |
| Warner      | 12,693  | 18.2                 | 9.7                   | 10.3                  | 13.7                    | 13.5                    | 11.4                    | 13.1                    | 6.5                     | 4                   |
| Middlesex   | 7,949   | 13.9                 | 6.9                   | 6.9                   | 12.5                    | 13.8                    | 14.2                    | 18.3                    | 11.7                    | 7.5                 |
| Northmouth  | 10,060  | 13.4                 | 10.8                  | 9.3                   | 17.0                    | 12.9                    | 10.8                    | 15.1                    | 6.8                     | 3                   |
| North La    | 2,376   | 7.9                  | 5.8                   | 4.0                   | 13.2                    | 12.0                    | 14.7                    | 22.0                    | 14.3                    | 4                   |
| Ocean       | 2,146   | 16.4                 | 9.1                   | 8.4                   | 13.9                    | 16.6                    | 11.6                    | 16.9                    | 5.6                     | 5                   |
| Pasapio     | 13,722  | 21.5                 | 12.3                  | 9.3                   | 15.3                    | 13.6                    | 10.6                    | 10.6                    | 4.4                     | 1.6                 |
| Salem       | 2,276   | 16.9                 | 12.2                  | 9.3                   | 12.2                    | 17.3                    | 11.0                    | 15.0                    | 4.0                     | 0.5                 |
| Seawest     | 2,330   | 5.1                  | 4.2                   | 4.7                   | 13.1                    | 13.1                    | 12.7                    | 23.9                    | 17.4                    | 5.3                 |
| Swamp       | 136     | 2.2                  | 2.2                   | 1.5                   | 12.3                    | 14.0                    | 19.2                    | 39.4                    | 11.7                    | 7.2                 |
| Union       | 19,354  | 10.2                 | 6.6                   | 8.2                   | 14.1                    | 14.2                    | 12.9                    | 15.8                    | 12.8                    | 3.2                 |
| Warren      | 228     | 15.7                 | 10.1                  | 5.2                   | 5.2                     | 17.1                    | 17.9                    | 12.4                    | 15.3                    | 3.9                 |

Table 4

Resident Births of the State of New Jersey by Age, by Race, by Sex  
1981

| Age of<br>Mother | <u>TOTAL</u> |          | <u>WHITE</u> |          | <u>BLACK</u> |          |
|------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|                  | <u>#</u>     | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u>     | <u>%</u> | <u>#</u>     | <u>%</u> |
| 14 or less       | 281          | 0.3      | 81           | 0.1      | 199          | 1.1      |
| 15               | 609          | 0.6      | 231          | 0.3      | 374          | 2.0      |
| 16               | 1,308        | 1.4      | 605          | 0.8      | 696          | 3.8      |
| 17               | 2,100        | 2.2      | 1,075        | 1.5      | 1,025        | 5.5      |
| 18               | 3,031        | 3.2      | 1,754        | 2.4      | 1,255        | 6.8      |
| 19               | 3,804        | 4.0      | 2,424        | 3.3      | 1,343        | 7.1      |
| 20-24            | 16,290       | 27.3     | 19,565       | 26.4     | 6,250        | 33.9     |
| 25-29            | 32,425       | 33.7     | 26,911       | 36.3     | 4,188        | 22.6     |
| 30-34            | 20,489       | 21.3     | 16,901       | 22.8     | 2,287        | 12.4     |
| 35-39            | 5,126        | 5.3      | 4,002        | 5.4      | 699          | 3.8      |
| 40-44            | 702          | 0.7      | 508          | 0.7      | 137          | 0.7      |
| 45 or more       | 33           | .        | 24           | .        | 4            | .        |
| Unknown          | 7            | .        | 5            | .        | 2            | .        |

TABLE 5Black Students Enrolled in Public Schools by County, Fall, '80, '81, & '82

|              | <u>Enrolled</u> | <u>% of</u><br><u>County</u> | <u>Enrolled</u> | <u>% of</u><br><u>County</u> | <u>Enrolled</u> | <u>% of</u><br><u>County</u> |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Atlantic     | 9,120           | 17.0                         | 8,810           | 17.0                         | 8,476           | 16.7                         |
| Bergen       | 6,961           | 5.6                          | 6,674           | 5.6                          | 6,458           | 5.7                          |
| Burlington   | 11,513          | 16.8                         | 11,340          | 17.1                         | 11,142          | 17.4                         |
| Camden       | 17,800          | 20.7                         | 17,793          | 21.5                         | 17,669          | 21.7                         |
| Cape May     | 1,292           | 10.7                         | 1,256           | 10.8                         | 1,217           | 10.6                         |
| Cumberland   | 6,407           | 23.2                         | 6,235           | 23.3                         | 6,163           | 23.6                         |
| Essex        | 68,432          | 48.5                         | 67,058          | 49.2                         | 66,001          | 49.2                         |
| Gloucester   | 4,400           | 11.5                         | 4,332           | 11.5                         | 4,381           | 11.9                         |
| Hudson       | 16,934          | 21.8                         | 16,548          | 22.0                         | 15,783          | 21.4                         |
| Hunterdon    | 130             | 0.7                          | 129             | 0.7                          | 129             | 0.8                          |
| Mercer       | 13,304          | 27.9                         | 13,194          | 28.4                         | 13,185          | 28.9                         |
| Middlesex    | 8,336           | 8.5                          | 8,123           | 8.6                          | 8,262           | 9.1                          |
| Monmouth     | 11,576          | 12.8                         | 11,171          | 12.5                         | 11,180          | 12.9                         |
| Morris       | 2,249           | 2.9                          | 2,249           | 3.0                          | 2,202           | 3.1                          |
| Ocean        | 2,878           | 4.7                          | 2,825           | 4.7                          | 2,753           | 4.7                          |
| Passaic      | 16,334          | 21.9                         | 15,681          | 21.7                         | 15,115          | 21.5                         |
| Salem        | 2,766           | 21.5                         | 2,618           | 21.1                         | 2,574           | 21.0                         |
| Somerset     | 2,553           | 7.1                          | 2,533           | 7.4                          | 2,511           | 7.7                          |
| Sussex       | 154             | 0.6                          | 146             | 0.6                          | 133             | 0.6                          |
| Union        | 20,397          | 26.5                         | 20,026          | 27.0                         | 19,604          | 27.2                         |
| Warren       | 232             | 1.4                          | 220             | 1.4                          | 233             | 1.5                          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>223,568</b>  | <b>17.9</b>                  | <b>218,971</b>  | <b>18.2</b>                  | <b>215,171</b>  | <b>18.4</b>                  |

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, Vital Educational Statistics,  
Volume I, 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83.

Table 6

Years of School Completed for Blacks 25 and Over by County  
Row Percents

|             | <u>Total</u> | <u>Elementary</u> | <u>Years of High School</u> |                  | <u>Years of College</u> |                  |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
|             |              |                   | <u>1 to 3</u>               | <u>4 or More</u> | <u>1 to 3</u>           | <u>4 or More</u> |
| State Total | 468,248      | 21.0              | 22.6                        | 34.6             | 13.2                    | 8.6              |
| Atlantic    | 18,187       | 26.1              | 25.3                        | 27.8             | 13.0                    | 7.5              |
| Bergen      | 19,527       | 14.8              | 16.7                        | 35.9             | 16.3                    | 7.1              |
| Burlington  | 21,666       | 10.4              | 15.8                        | 40.3             | 20.6                    | 12.9             |
| Camden      | 22,895       | 21.0              | 24.1                        | 32.5             | 13.8                    | 8.6              |
| Cape May    | 2,748        | 26.6              | 29.1                        | 27.8             | 9.5                     | 7.0              |
| Cumberland  | 9,118        | 35.1              | 27.4                        | 25.5             | 8.3                     | 7.7              |
| Essex       | 162,798      | 20.4              | 23.2                        | 35.1             | 13.4                    | 7.7              |
| Gloucester  | 9,135        | 23.7              | 23.4                        | 32.8             | 12.3                    | 7.8              |
| Hudson      | 33,040       | 23.8              | 24.9                        | 32.4             | 11.4                    | 7.5              |
| Hunterdon   | 524          | 33.0              | 30.9                        | 17.0             | 10.5                    | 6.6              |
| Mercer      | 27,955       | 22.5              | 25.3                        | 35.6             | 10.1                    | 6.5              |
| Middlesex   | 17,941       | 19.1              | 19.5                        | 34.3             | 14.2                    | 12.9             |
| Monmouth    | 22,393       | 22.9              | 20.1                        | 34.0             | 14.3                    | 8.7              |
| Morris      | 5,723        | 16.9              | 16.9                        | 35.8             | 16.6                    | 7.7              |
| Ocean       | 4,333        | 24.2              | 23.2                        | 32.9             | 11.5                    | 9.2              |
| Passaic     | 27,097       | 27.8              | 25.2                        | 33.2             | 9.2                     | 4.6              |
| Salem       | 4,842        | 16.8              | 24.1                        | 26.6             | 9.1                     | 3.4              |
| Somerset    | 5,485        | 17.2              | 16.3                        | 37.6             | 13.9                    | 12.9             |
| Sussex      | 108          | 12.0              | 27.3                        | 14.9             | 18.2                    | 27.6             |
| Union       | 42,084       | 16.9              | 21.1                        | 39.6             | 13.0                    | 8.4              |
| Warren      | 449          | 22.7              | 11.1                        | 33.9             | 19.2                    | 13.1             |

TABLE 7Public School Dropout Rate of Black Students, Academic Years 1979-1981

|            | 79-80           | % of          | 80-81           | % of          | 81-82           | % of          |
|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
|            | <u>Dropouts</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Dropouts</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Dropouts</u> | <u>County</u> |
| Atlantic   | 296             | 31.4          | 273             | 31.8          | 200             | 29.5          |
| Bergen     | 184             | 12.5          | 141             | 10.5          | 143             | 14.0          |
| Burlington | 104             | 12.3          | 121             | 14.2          | 121             | 16.1          |
| Camden     | 282             | 20.5          | 347             | 24.9          | 311             | 23.7          |
| Cape May   | 33              | 10.7          | 27              | 8.2           | 18              | 7.7           |
| Camberland | 143             | 21.3          | 154             | 23.1          | 160             | 27.8          |
| Essex      | 1,849           | 61.3          | 1,393           | 55.5          | 1,622           | 62.7          |
| Gloucester | 100             | 14.7          | 76              | 12.6          | 71              | 14.6          |
| Hudson     | 410             | 23.8          | 535             | 26.9          | 476             | 27.8          |
| Hunterdon  | 1               | 0.7           | 2               | 1.4           | 0               | 0.0           |
| Maricac    | 588             | 54.7          | 399             | 50.9          | 416             | 48.1          |
| Middlesex  | 184             | 11.8          | 178             | 12.8          | 210             | 15.4          |
| Monmouth   | 272             | 16.6          | 275             | 17.9          | 225             | 16.7          |
| Morris     | 41              | 4.8           | 43              | 6.0           | 37              | 5.2           |
| Ocean      | 81              | 6.9           | 72              | 6.9           | 84              | 9.5           |
| Passaic    | 541             | 36.0          | 723             | 37.4          | 740             | 37.9          |
| Salem      | 47              | 18.7          | 58              | 25.8          | 71              | 23.3          |
| Somerset   | 75              | 15.9          | 35              | 11.0          | 54              | 17.4          |
| Sussex     | 2               | 0.7           | 1               | 0.4           | 0               | 0.0           |
| Union      | 437             | 36.5          | 471             | 39.5          | 312             | 34.8          |
| Warren     | 2               | 0.7           | 4               | 1.2           | 5               | 1.9           |
| Total      | 5,672           | 26.4          | 5,328           | 26.2          | 5,278           | 28.0          |

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, Vital Educational Statistics,  
Volume I, 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83.

## MOUNT LAUREL II -- A BRIEF DESCRIPTION

Access to decent, affordable housing has long been regarded as central to the pursuit of happiness in American society. Indeed, housing is preceded only by employment as an essential element in considerations of quality of life in this country. Yet, for many of the nation's poor and especially, poor minorities, housing opportunities have been severely limited and in some instances non-existent. In some cases the kind of housing available to those of small means has been a function of market forces -- good housing has been beyond their financial reach. But in many instances access to decent housing has been denied as a result of exclusionary practices employed to keep some groups from becoming a part of a community. Where minorities are concerned, the issue of access, all too often, has been cast in terms of social undesirability.

Although New Jersey has had housing anti-discrimination laws as part of its state statutes for some time, these laws have had little meaning outside of central cities. Access to housing in New Jersey's suburbs has been limited to only a handful of the state's low and moderate income residents, even fewer minorities -- regardless of income -- and almost no minorities of low income.

In 1975, the New Jersey Supreme Court struck at this peculiar aspect of the state's landscape. The Court, that year, decided in Southern Burlington County NAACP v Township of Mount Laurel that zoning

ordinances of a developing municipality are invalid if they fail to provide a realistic opportunity for the construction of housing to meet the municipality's fair share of the low- and moderate-income housing needed in the region. This was the landmark Mount Laurel I decision that some expected would result in opening up the suburbs to the many who previously had been excluded. This, however, did not occur. Instead, municipalities faced with challenges to their restrictive zoning ordinances flooded the lower courts with lengthy and expensive litigation. And outside of central cities, few low- and moderate-income houses were built.

Eight years after Mount Laurel I, the New Jersey Supreme Court spoke once again to the issue of exclusionary zoning. In its second Mount Laurel decision the court declared: "The State controls the use of land, all of the land. In exercising that control, it cannot favor rich over poor. It cannot legislatively set aside dilapidated housing in urban ghettos for the poor and decent housing elsewhere for everyone else." The Court came to grips in Mount Laurel II with the weaknesses of Mount Laurel I. It imposed on all municipalities a requirement to act affirmatively in making provisions for housing its own low- and moderate-income<sup>1</sup> citizens and it instructed developing municipalities to meet not only their local needs but to provide their fair share of the housing needed in the region. It then instructed municipalities to offer "affirmative inducements" to developers in order to facilitate construction of the type of housing mandated.

The Court set up a structure for resolving such issues as the definition of a "region" and determination of "fair share." Three



judges, each handling a region of the state, will hear all Mount Laurel type cases and will resolve such questions as fair share and what comprises a region. And in determining which communities are developing and which are excluded from the affirmative requirement, the judges would rely on the State Development Guide Plan. This document, prepared by the Bureau of State Planning in the Department of Community Affairs, has been uniformly regarded as a useless collection of planning drafts. The Court's designation of the Plan as a tool in decision-making regarding the allocation of low and moderate income housing overnight catapulted the Guide Plan into true significance.

In a very real sense the Court, in its unanimous decision, attempted to address every possible evasive tactic likely to emerge from recalcitrant municipalities. The extent of its serious intent is reflected in one sentence in the decision, "We may not build houses," the Court said, "but we do enforce the Constitution," There can be little doubt that the Court was making clear its lack of tolerance for further foot dragging by New Jersey communities wishing to circumvent their Constitutional responsibilities.

The Editor

**Footnote**

- 1 Low income housing is that housing which is affordable to individuals with incomes of 50 percent or below the region's median income. Moderate income housing is that which is affordable to individuals with incomes of 50 percent to 80 percent of the region's median. Housing costs should consume no more than 25 percent to 30 percent of gross income.

## MOUNT LAUREL II: A BLACK LAWYER'S PERSPECTIVE

Robert Holmes

One critical implication of The Mount Laurel II decision for the black community is its reminder of the need for organizational machinery to monitor and "enforce" the new law's most important potential -- access to affordable housing.

Unlike a number of classic statements on race relations made by the highest courts of New Jersey and the United States in the past thirty years, involving employment, housing, education and fundamental civil rights, the Mount Laurel II opinion does not address race relations per se in New Jersey. The underlying constitutional requirements of substantive due process and equal protection do not refer to fundamental fairness and equal treatment for racial minorities. Rather, the protection which is deemed to be essential to the general welfare is afforded to an economic underclass described as low and moderate income persons.<sup>1</sup>

The Court describes the constitutional basis for the new law in terms of a requirement that state action in the exercise of the police power -- "where the exercise of that power. . . effects something as fundamental as housing" -- must be exercised for the general welfare of

Robert Holmes, a graduate of Harvard Law School, was Assistant Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs in the Byrne Administration. He is currently the Executive Director of the Newark Watershed Conservation and Development Corporation

the region in which the governmental unit is located.<sup>2</sup> The Court then reaches its apparent goal, primarily in a footnote, by describing the "general welfare" in terms of the deconcentration of urban poor by way of the production of low and moderate income housing units in the suburbs -- the theory being that the concentration of poverty in urban areas produces problems that negatively impact the state as a whole and that, therefore, the removal of such concentrations will have widespread positive impact.<sup>3</sup>

In another footnote, the Court sets forth its definition of low and moderate income families to describe the primary target populations for the mandated housing. Moderate income families are described as those whose incomes are no greater than 80 percent and no less than 50 percent of the median income of the area, while low income families are described as those whose incomes do not exceed 50 percent of the median income of the area.<sup>4</sup>

This brief review of the constitutional basis and apparent social intent of the Mount Laurel II decision suggests that the primary significance of the new law for the black community lies in the extent to which 1) black New Jersey residents live in the state's deteriorating urban areas and 2) black New Jersey residents are poor as compared to the general population in a particular Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of which the urban area is a recognized part.

Calculations made using available 1980 census data reveal the following

1. Over 50 percent of the 925,000 Black residents of New Jersey are concentrated in the seven (7) most densely populated urban and municipalities.<sup>5</sup>

- 2 Approximately 71 percent of New Jersey's black population reside in the 42 urban aid communities.<sup>6</sup>

We may conclude that New Jersey's black residents are characteristically urban dwellers as compared to their total numbers

It is also significant to note:

1. Only 7 percent of the 6,127,090 white residents of New Jersey live in the seven (7) most densely populated urban aid municipalities.<sup>7</sup>
2. Only 24 percent of the state's white residents live in all 42 urban municipalities.<sup>8</sup>

We may conclude that New Jersey's white residents are not primarily urban dwellers as compared to their total numbers.

However, note must also be made of these facts:

- 1 While black residents comprise 51 percent of the seven (7) most densely populated urban aid municipalities in New Jersey, 49 percent are white residents.<sup>9</sup>
2. and while blacks make up 31 percent of the 42 urban aid municipalities, 69 percent are white residents.<sup>10</sup>

Therefore, while blacks tend to live in high density urban areas more than whites in proportion to the two populations respective total numbers in New Jersey, there are far more white residents in high density areas than there are black residents in high density areas.

Further, we should consider the following

1. 11,408 black families in the seven (7) most densely populated urban and municipalities in New Jersey qualify as low income pursuant to the "Mount Laurel" income test.<sup>11</sup>
2. 14,391 white families in the seven (7) most densely populated urban and municipalities in New Jersey qualify as low income.<sup>12</sup>
3. 13,489 black families in all 42 urban and municipalities qualify as low income.<sup>13</sup>
4. 27,512 white families in all 42 urban and municipalities qualify as low income.<sup>14</sup>
5. 15,057 black families in the seven (7) most densely populated urban and municipalities in New Jersey qualify as moderate income pursuant to the "Mount Laurel" income test.<sup>15</sup>
6. 19,952 white families in the seven (7) most densely populated urban and municipalities qualify as moderate income.<sup>16</sup>
7. 17,698 black families in all 42 urban and municipalities qualify as moderate income.<sup>17</sup>
8. 41,041 white families in all 42 urban and municipalities qualify as moderate income.<sup>18</sup>

It would seem to follow from the statistics cited above that it is highly conceivable that the Mount Laurel II doctrine could enjoy significant success without directly affecting a single black family.

Let us, for the moment, hold aside important considerations of the comparative gain or loss for the black community associated with the dispersal of black concentration from urban to suburban areas. If we assume 1) that there are significant numbers of poor black New Jerseyans

whose lives would be improved by access to an affordable residence in a suburban community, and 2) that the strength of the law created by the Mount Laurel II decision will in fact result in the production of low and moderate income housing in many New Jersey suburbs, then our primary concern should be whether black families gain access to the new affordable housing units in proportion to their qualifications under the "Mount Laurel" income tests.

Three critical questions combine to point up the significance of this concern.

1. Will there be resistance to the creation of "Mount Laurel" housing, especially as it relates to the inclusion of black families?
2. Will there be competition from white families for newly created units?
3. Are coalitions likely to emerge between qualifying black families and other individuals or groups with a vested interest in the implementation of Mount Laurel II?

The eight year history between Mount Laurel I and Mount Laurel II provides an adequate indication of the certainty that stringent resistance will be forthcoming from suburban communities to the letter and spirit of the new law. Further, no one could argue effectively that the exclusionary zoning practices that led to the Mount Laurel decisions were not grounded in deliberate efforts by suburban municipalities to create and maintain images that they regarded as threatened by the presence of poor families. Consider also that the rush of conferences

and seminars organized since the release of the decision focused primarily on ways and means by which affected New Jersey municipalities might legally "cope" with the new law. Finally, to anyone who is at all aware of social relations in America, it is clear that the level of resistance to acceptance of the social integration mandated by the Mount Laurel court will increase as the issue moves from poor to black to black poor.

For several reasons, competition for affordable housing in the suburbs will be steep from New Jersey's poor white residents. First, recent studies reveal that the quest for the American Dream of a house in suburbia is alive and well.<sup>19</sup> Second, in reaching for ways to "cope" with the new law, suburban municipalities will find accepting poor whites an attractive way to avoid even less desirable results in their effort to win the "fair share race." Finally, given the Court's ruling that "...in no-growth areas... (limited growth, conservation and agriculture), no municipality will have to provide for more than the present need generated within the municipality."<sup>22</sup> White families, who constitute a far greater share of the "indigenous poor" suburban population than do black families, will be first in line for affordable units created pursuant to this section of the new law.

With regard to coalitions between blacks and other interest groups, the likelihood is slim to nonexistent. This is due in large part to what this writer would phrase the "reluctant identification syndrome" in America. To the typical white citizen or group, to identify an interest in common with blacks in America is to fall to the lowest rungs of American society.



In the short run, black poor will be left to their own devices, or the influence and efforts of black support groups, to attain recognition in the quest for Mount Laurel housing. It is imperative that existing black civil rights groups add the matter of access to affordable housing in the suburbs to their agenda if positive results are to be had. It is imperative also that suburban municipalities and housing producers be made aware of the emergence of a black monitoring network sophisticated in the details of the new law.

Fortunately, there are numerous tools available to begin a monitoring effort. A significant element of the Mount Laurel II opinion, for example, holds that "Any individual demonstrating an interest in, or any organization that has the objective of, securing low income housing opportunities in a municipality will have standing to sue such municipality on Mount Laurel grounds."<sup>21</sup> In addition, the Court provides for penalties on developers for misuse of the new law<sup>22</sup> and for strong remedies for non-compliance by defendant municipalities.<sup>23</sup> Also, there is available the "Sunshine Law" granting interested support groups access to the conduct of suburban Planning Board meetings in time to impact decision and in ways that will tend to keep the process honest.<sup>24</sup>

Black interest groups might consider creating or supporting development companies in order to take advantage of certain developer incentives built into the law<sup>25</sup> and to gain some greater measure of control over the housing production process. The slow evolution of the Mount Laurel law has allowed time for many litigations to emerge thereby creating a readymade list of suburban communities for priority targeting. Finally, however, the greatest tool is the intensity of

commitment to the letter and spirit of the new law apparent in the carefully written unanimous opinion authored by the Chief Justice

In conclusion, others will at length debate the pros and cons related to encouraging the dispersal of black urban concentration in terms of political influence, social service delivery and other considerations of deep importance to the black community. However, if access to the protections of the Mount Laurel decision and to the affordable housing for poor people it mandates is regarded as a goal worth achieving, then a network of black organizations needs to be marshalled now to begin a campaign for the black "fair share "

If, however, the devices provided by the Mount Laurel court prove to be inadequate for this goal, then it is incumbent upon that network to recoil the wheels of the judiciary to develop affirmative action laws directed this time at fundamental fairness and equal protection for racial minorities, a scenario very familiar to the entirety of the black community.

## Footnotes

- 1 Southern Burlington County N A A C P v Mount Laurel Township 92, N.J. 158 pg. 209.
2. Ibid. pg. 208.
3. Ibid pg. 209.
4. Ibid at footnote 8 pg 221 "Area" is described as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA)
- 5 Calculated from data derived from New Jersey 1980 Census Counts of Population By Race and Spanish Origin, State Data Center, March 1981 and New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Division of Local Government Services The seven most densely populated urban aid municipalities were determined by taking available 1980 population figures and dividing by available square mile information.
- 6 Ibid. Urban aid communities are those qualified by the State for FY 1983.
7. Ibid
8. Ibid
9. Ibid
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Calculated by taking the median income for the SMSA (County) of each of the seven municipalities then comparing those number to income estimates for families by race contained in New Jersey 1980 Census of Population and Housing Municipal Profiles Volume V Income and Poverty Estimates For Families, Households and Persons Parts A and B and to the Mount Laurel Court's definitions for low and moderate income set forth in footnote 8 of the opinion.
12. Ibid
13. Calculated by taking the median income for the SMSA (County) for all 42 urban aid municipalities then comparing those numbers to income estimates for families by race contained in N J 1980 Census of Population and Housing Municipal Profiles Volume V Income and Poverty Estimates for Families, Households and Persons Parts A and B and to the Mount Laurel Court's definitions for low and moderate income set forth in footnote 8 of the opinion.
14. Ibid.
15. 12 op cit.
- 16 Ibid.

- 17 14 op cit.
18. Ibid.
- 19 A Psychology of Building How We Share and Experience Our Structured Space, Lynn, Glenn Robert, Prentice Hall 1980, p 48ff.
20. South Burlington County N.A A C.P. v. Mount Laurel Township op cit., pg 244
21. Ibid. pg 337.
22. Ibid. pg 280.
23. Ibid. pg. 285-290.
24. "Open Public Meetings Law" New Jersey P L 1975, Chapter 231, Section 5.
- 25 Southern Burlington op cit., pg. 258-277 and 279-281.

## BLACK POPULATION TRENDS AND THEIR POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Bruce Ransom

During the 1970s, New Jersey's black population expanded briskly and became less concentrated in central cities.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the black population rose in all counties save one (see Table 1). The high rate of black population growth (20 percent) and the modest increase in the general population (3 percent) contributed to the black share of New Jersey's population expanding to nearly 13 percent. Furthermore, the U.S. Census Bureau reports that a majority (53 percent) of the state's blacks became suburban residents in the 1970s.

At first glance, the dispersal of blacks suggests an erosion of the black political base in central cities. On the contrary, a close examination of black settlement patterns and the distribution of blacks within counties throughout the state indicate an expanding black political base. Significant black population growth and less concentration in inner-cities, but perpetual centralization in a growing number of the counties' political subdivisions facilitates enlarging the sphere of black influence. An examination of the extent of black dispersal and the distribution of blacks throughout the state permits an assessment of the impact of recent population changes on New Jersey's

---

Bruce Ransom, Ph D. is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Rutgers - New Brunswick and Faculty Associate at the Eagleton Institute of Politics.

TABLE 1  
BLACK POPULATION TRENDS IN NEW JERSEY, 1970-1980

| Counties by Region                 | Population Trends |         |           |         |                             |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------------------------|
|                                    | 1970              | % Black | 1980      | % Black | Percent Change 1970 to 1980 |
| The State                          | 7,171,112         |         | 7,364,823 |         | + 2.7                       |
| Black Total                        | 770,292           | 10.7    | 925,066   | 12.6    | +20.1                       |
| North Jersey                       | 476,068           | 13.8    | 559,911   | 17.5    | +17.6                       |
| Bergen                             | 24,915            | 2.8     | 33,043    | 3.9     | +32.6                       |
| Essex                              | 279,136           | 30.0    | 316,440   | 37.2    | +13.4                       |
| Hudson                             | 61,095            | 10.0    | 70,050    | 12.6    | +14.7                       |
| Passaic                            | 50,199            | 10.9    | 59,171    | 13.2    | +17.9                       |
| Union                              | 60,723            | 11.2    | 81,207    | 16.1    | +33.7                       |
| Region as a Percent of Black Total | 61.8              |         | 60.5      |         |                             |
| Northwest-Central Jersey           | 93,790            | 5.5     | 114,189   | 6.3     | +21.7                       |
| Hunterdon                          | 1,166             | 1.7     | 1,123     | 1.3     | - 3.7                       |
| Mercer                             | 49,002            | 16.4    | 55,545    | 18.0    | +11.5                       |
| Middlesex                          | 26,067            | 4.5     | 35,768    | 6.0     | +37.2                       |
| Morris                             | 8,483             | 2.2     | 10,017    | 2.5     | +18.1                       |
| Somerset                           | 7,166             | 3.6     | 10,173    | 5.0     | +41.3                       |
| Sussex                             | 311               | 0.4     | 680       | 0.6     | +118.6                      |
| Warren                             | 795               | 1.1     | 933       | 1.1     | +17.4                       |
| Region as a Percent of Black Total | 12.2              |         | 12.3      |         |                             |
| South Jersey                       | 200,434           | 9.8     | 250,966   | 10.6    | +25.2                       |
| Atlantic                           | 30,403            | 17.4    | 34,134    | 17.6    | +12.3                       |
| Burlington                         | 28,162            | 8.7     | 45,471    | 12.5    | +61.5                       |
| Camden                             | 52,318            | 11.5    | 67,232    | 14.3    | +28.5                       |
| Cape May                           | 4,772             | 8.0     | 5,157     | 6.3     | + 8.1                       |
| Cumberland                         | 16,566            | 13.6    | 19,868    | 15.0    | +19.9                       |
| Gloucester                         | 14,444            | 8.4     | 16,936    | 8.5     | +17.3                       |
| Monmouth                           | 38,275            | 8.3     | 42,985    | 8.5     | +12.3                       |
| Ocean                              | 6,261             | 3.0     | 9,439     | 2.7     | +50.0                       |
| Salem                              | 9,233             | 15.3    | 9,744     | 15.1    | + 5.5                       |
| Region as a Percent of Black Total | 26.0              |         | 27.1      |         |                             |

SOURCES: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population: General Population Characteristics. PC80-1-B32. New Jersey (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982), Table 44 and U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population. Characteristics of the Population. Volume I, Part 32-Section 1. New Jersey (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), Tables 33 and 34.

NOTE: Due to rounding, percentages for the 1980 regional distribution of blacks do not equal 100 percent.

black political base.

## BLACK DISPERSAL AND CLUSTERING

The Census Bureau's designation of suburban areas overstates the existence of comfortable suburban communities in New Jersey. Two large cities -- Camden and Elizabeth -- are labeled suburban areas, while Clifton and Sayreville stand for central cities.<sup>2</sup> The high and positive correlation between social and economic disadvantage and inner-city location indicates that municipalities experiencing distress, conceptually are similar -- regardless of the Census Bureau's designations. Municipalities qualifying for state aid from the Urban Aid program meet this standard.<sup>3</sup> Beginning in 1969, the program distributed special aid to New Jersey's six large cities -- Camden, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Newark, Paterson, and Trenton. In state fiscal year 1980 (municipal calendar year 1979), the six large cities and twenty-six other localities qualified for urban aid funding.<sup>4</sup> By state fiscal year 1984 (municipal calendar year 1983), forty-two jurisdictions received urban aid funds.<sup>5</sup> Localities qualifying for urban aid funds are a diverse group, but they are selected on the basis of a state formula that sets minimum standards for identifying common social and economic problems such as physical decay, high crime rates, high dependent population, and declining economic base. The extent of black settlement in these localities, rather than the Census Bureau's designation of central cities and suburban areas, permits an accurate assessment of black dispersal and continual clustering.

Blacks are located disproportionately in urban aid municipalities. For instance, in fiscal year 1980 (all references are to the state fiscal year), these municipalities accounted for 27 percent of the state's population, but 71 percent of the black population. In fiscal year 1984, urban aid jurisdictions embrace nearly one-third of New Jersey's population and almost three-fourths of the black population. Black population dispersal notwithstanding, blacks are clustered in urban aid municipalities.

To be sure, the high proportion of blacks residing in distressed communities creates a dilemma. On the one hand, black settlement in urban aid communities is illustrative of the continual segregation of blacks in jurisdictions experiencing distress or enroute to social and economic decline. On the other hand, the persistent clustering of the black population allows the continuation of the black political base in large cities and favors the expansion of that base to outlying political subdivisions, particularly inner-municipalities. Although the proportion of the state black population residing in the six large cities declined from 52 percent of all blacks in 1970 to 44 percent in 1980, the number of blacks in the large cities increased by a modest 2 percent. Moreover, the decline of the total population in these cities allowed the black share of the population to rise in each of them. Significantly, 54 percent of black suburbanites reside in jurisdictions qualifying for urban aid funds in fiscal year 1984. The comparable figure for the general population is 22 percent. Blacks are dispersing, but a majority of blacks have settled in distressed localities, especially within the economic orbit of the large cities.



## BLACK POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND THE BLACK POLITICAL BASE

Paradoxically, the growth and dispersal of the black population, but the concomitant clustering of blacks in urban aid communities, particularly those in proximity of large cities, maintains the black urban political base and expands it to a higher number of political subdivisions. The diversity of urban aid municipalities notwithstanding, black political activity must continue to concern itself with community economic recovery and human resource development. The dispersal, but clustering of the black population, facilitates a territorial expansion that broadens the base of black political influence in local and state politics. Black access and influence in state politics depends upon the development of a solid political base within clusters of political subdivisions across New Jersey.

North Jersey Table 1 reveals that North Jersey's black population rose by 18 percent in the 1970s. (The region's total population declined by 7 percent.) Three-fifths of the state's blacks are located in North Jersey. The core of the region's black political base is anchored by urban aid localities (for fiscal year 1984) beginning in East Orange-Newark (Essex County) extending eastward to Jersey City (Hudson County) and southward to Elizabeth and Plainfield in Union County.

Generally, the number and proportion of blacks in the localities qualifying for urban aid funds in fiscal year 1984 increased in the 1970s. In Essex County, for instance, the number of blacks in Newark declined by 8 percent, but the proportion of the city's blacks rose from 54 percent to 58 percent. Tremendous black population growth around

Newark expanded East Orange's black majority from 53 percent to 83 percent and established a black majority in Orange as its black population proportion rose from 36 to 57 percent. More significantly, the black share of the population in Irvington climbed from 4 percent to 38 percent. These four localities, plus the two other urban and municipalities -- Belleville (2 percent black) and Bloomfield (3 percent black) -- embrace 95 percent of Essex County's blacks.

In Hudson County, blacks are concentrated in Jersey City (28 percent black). The vast majority (88 percent) of the county's blacks are housed in this city. Black population growth in the 1970s occurred primarily in Jersey City and the county's other urban and communities, but Jersey City is the only locality with a black share of the population above 5 percent. Nonetheless, Jersey City and the other urban and jurisdictions -- Bayonne, Hoboken, Kearny, North Bergen, Union City, Weehawken, and West New York -- embody slightly more than 99 percent of the county's blacks.

Blacks in Union County are dispersed over several communities in the Elizabeth to Plainfield area, especially the urban and localities. For example, the urban and municipalities of Elizabeth, Plainfield, Rahway, and Roselle constitute 71 percent of the county's blacks. However, Hillside, a nonurban and community bordering Elizabeth and Newark, experienced a rise in the black share of its population from 2 percent to 30 percent in the 1970s. Hillside, Plainfield (60 percent), and Roselle (28 percent) are the Union County political subdivisions with the highest proportion of blacks, but Elizabeth (18 percent) is second to Plainfield in the number of blacks.

Something should also be said about the black population in Passaic and Bergen counties. Only two jurisdictions in Passaic County -- Passaic (20 percent black) and Paterson (34 percent black) -- are urban and communities. The county's blacks are concentrated (97 percent) in these two cities. Bergen County is without urban and municipalities, but a cluster of localities -- Englewood (41 percent black), Hackensack (21 percent black), and Teaneck (24 percent black) -- contain four-fifths of the county's blacks.

The black political base in North Jersey primarily consists of the region's four large cities and the several municipalities within their economic orbit, especially urban and communities. Eleven of the fifteen municipalities with at least a black share of the population around 20 percent are urban and localities. Further, four of those communities have black majorities. These jurisdictions are the foundation for electoral politics at the municipal, county, and state legislative district level in the region.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the upcoming redrawing of the state's congressional districts could strengthen black influence in federal elections.

Urban and municipalities are the major pillars, though not the only ones, of the region's black political base. The territorial expansion of the black political base and black participation in grass-roots community organization and in electoral politics provides a base for black participation and influence in state legislative politics. Six legislative districts -- the 20th District, the 27th through the 29th Districts, the 31st District, and the 35th District -- are the basis for black participation and influence in state politics. Each of these

districts embrace a number of urban aid communities and a black share of the population that is above the proportion of blacks in New Jersey. These districts are the basis for promoting urban interest in the twenty-four of forty legislative districts composed of some urban aid localities across the state. These legislative districts are the basis for expanding black influence in state politics.

Northwest-Central Jersey. Blacks are less numerous in Northwest-Central Jersey than they are in North Jersey. However, Table 1 discloses that the rate of black population growth is higher in this region than in North Jersey. Even so, only 12 percent of the state's blacks reside in the region. Northwest-Central Jersey's blacks are centralized in Mercer and Middlesex counties. In Mercer County, the current urban aid communities of Trenton and Hamilton embrace 81 percent of the county's blacks. For Middlesex County, in comparison, the urban aid localities of Carteret, New Brunswick, Old Bridge, and Perth Amboy comprise only 48 percent of the county's blacks. In Warren County, Phillipsburg, an urban aid community, includes 24 percent of the county's blacks. The low proportion of the counties' black population residing in urban aid municipalities (Mercer County excepted) does not preclude black clustering. For example, nearly 54 percent of blacks in Middlesex and Somerset counties reside in New Brunswick and the adjoining nonurban aid communities of Franklin Township (Somerset County) and Piscataway (Middlesex County). A similar pattern is found in Ewing and Lawrence in the Trenton area. Clearly, blacks are generally more dispersed in Northwest-Central Jersey than in North Jersey, but they are centralized in and around a few municipalities.

four localities -- Trenton (45 percent black), New Brunswick (29 percent black), Franklin Townships (22 percent black), and the non urban aid community of Morristown (25 percent black) in Morris County -- are the basis for black population clustering in the region.

Black electoral successes have been limited in the region. However, in the Trenton area blacks have scored victories at the municipal, county, and state legislative district levels. There have been scattered black electoral successes in municipal politics elsewhere in the region. Indeed, a black mayor served in Franklin Township until the town council reorganized on July 1, 1983. In addition to electoral strategies, nonelectoral strategies for achieving political influence are appropriate at the local and state legislative district levels in the region. The 17th Legislative District, which includes the urban aid municipalities of New Brunswick and Plainfield, along with the 15th District in the Trenton area are the basis for linking local political influence to state legislative district politics. Both of these districts contain urban aid communities and they have black population proportions of a little more than one-quarter. Success in municipal politics, electoral and otherwise, is the basis for political influence at higher levels of government.

South Jersey. There are some important similarities between black settlement patterns in South Jersey and Northwest-Central Jersey. Table 1 shows that South Jersey's 25 percent increase in the number of blacks in the 1970s leads the state by outpacing Northwest-Central Jersey. In the state's total population, the 7 percent increase in the population of Northwest-Central Jersey and the 16 percent jump in the population of

South Jersey reflect a shift in the total population from North Jersey (the general population declined in North Jersey) to other regions, especially South Jersey. By comparison, the black population grew at a rate higher than the rate for the total population in South Jersey in all three regions. The distribution of the black population among the regions remained fairly stable in the 1970s, though there was some shifting to South Jersey (see Table 1).

The dispersal of blacks in South Jersey is comparable to the pattern in Northwest-Central Jersey. For example, in Camden County, the urban aid localities of Camden City, Gloucester Township, Lindenwold, Pennsauken, and Winslow contain 84 percent of the county's blacks. The proportion of the black population residing in urban aid jurisdictions in the other counties is lower than in Camden County. In Cumberland County, for instance, Bridgeton, Millville, and Vineland contain 65 percent of the county's black population. In Ocean County, Lakewood, the lone municipality qualifying for urban aid funds, houses 57 percent of the county's blacks. For Monmouth County, the distressed communities of Asbury Park, Keansburg, Long Branch, and Neptune Township include 55 percent of the black population. In Burlington County, Pemberton Township and Willingboro (recent urban aid qualifiers) comprise 38 percent of the county's blacks. Further, in Atlantic County, Atlantic City (an urban aid qualifier in previous years, but not in fiscal year 1984; yet the city's narrowly focused economic development strategy and its failure in human resource development required its inclusion among the distressed municipalities in this analysis) comprises 59 percent of the county's blacks (the city has less blacks than in 1970, but they are

currently a higher share of its population) The core of region's black population base revolves around seven municipalities -- Camden (53 percent black); Willingboro (38 percent black), Atlantic city, Pleasantville, Asbury Park (all 50 percent black), Neptune Township (32 percent black); and Bridgeton (35 percent black).

Interestingly, the highest amount of clustering of blacks among contiguous localities occurs in Burlington County around Willingboro and the nonurban aid communities of Burlington City, Burlington Township, and Edgewater Park in the Philadelphia area Generally, the municipalities in South Jersey with sizable numbers and proportions of blacks (those in Camden County included) tend not to be contiguous In terms of blacks residing in localities with sizable black populations, South Jersey's blacks are more dispersed and less centralized than in the other regions The relatively large land area and low population density in the municipalities contribute to this pattern.

An even more significant distinction between black settlement in South Jersey and elsewhere is the relatively large number of small towns with fairly sizable proportions of blacks. A few examples Lawnside (98 percent black) in Camden County has a total population of 3042; Salem City (44 percent black) in Salem County has a total population of 6959, and Buena Vista (20 percent black) in Atlantic County also has a total population of 6959 Several small towns in South Jersey have black majorities Invariably, these towns are too small to qualify for the Urban Aid program.

Blacks in several of the region's cities and small towns have been successful in electoral politics Moreover, Camden City and Atlantic

City, plus the towns of Lawnside and Chesilhurst, have elected black mayors and councilpersons. Further, Atlantic and Camden counties have blacks on their governing boards, and the Camden-Lawnside area has a black state legislator. There are also scores of black elected school board members throughout the region.

The cities and small towns, regardless of total population, make up the black political base in South Jersey. The territorial expanse of the black population, especially if the urban and communities and the small towns band together in common interest, is the base for black influence in local and state politics. The pursuit of a broad range of municipal political strategies and the banding together of blacks in distressed areas and elsewhere to pursue common interests through state politics depends on a black political base covering a number of political subdivisions and the articulation of a coherent set of policy objectives. Four state legislative districts in South Jersey are the basis for the election of blacks and the expansion of black political influence in state politics. The districts are the 2nd District (Atlantic City), the 5th District (Camden), the 7 District (Pennsauken and Willingboro), and the 11th District (Asbury Park, Long Branch, and Neptune Township). The exertion of political influence in state politics originates from the breadth of black participation and influence in a number of political subdivisions.



## CONCLUSIONS

Black population growth and dispersal in the 1970s, strengthens rather than weakens, the black political base. The continual clustering of the black population, especially around the major cities facilitates the growth of a critical political resource -- the black population -- in a growing number of political subdivisions.<sup>7</sup> The 20 percent growth in the black population, the dispersal of blacks primarily around major cities, the concomitant decrease in the total population of these cities, and the increase in the numbers (only Newark and Atlantic City experienced declines in the numbers of blacks) and proportions of the black population in almost all the state's major cities contributes to the maintenance of the black political base in those cities and its expansion to several nearby communities, usually distress areas, in counties across the state. The number of cities and towns with blacks representing 30 percent or more of their total populations, several of them with black majorities, contributes positively to the black political base.

Three-fourths of the black population resides in distressed areas that qualify for state funds from the Urban Aid program. These municipalities are the basis for blacks developing a comprehensive strategy for using public power to advance economic development in these localities simultaneously with programs to promote human resource development.<sup>8</sup> The growing pockets of blacks in an increasing number of political subdivisions across New Jersey, and the tendency for these localities to be distressed, unfolds the basis for pursuing broad state policy goals compatible with reversing economic decline and advancing

human resource development    Increased black participation in an expanding number of localities, particularly under conditions of black population growth across New Jersey, establishes the territorial base for maximum black influence in local and state politics.

## Footnotes

1. All data pertaining to population and the delineation of New Jersey into central cities and suburban areas were gleaned from U S Census Bureau documents. See footnote in Table 1
2. These problems spurred revisions in the formula for designating metropolitan areas. Beginning July 1, 1983, Elizabeth is a central city in the Newark area. See The New York Times, July 8, 1983, p A9
3. Information about the Urban Aid program was obtained from the following New Jersey Division of Local Government, 1980 Urban Aid Report, pp 1-15, Richard Lehne and James Robinson, New Jersey's Urban Strategy (Washington, D C . U S Government Printing Office, 1980), pp. 2-11 and documents supplied by the staff of the New Jersey Division of Legislative Information and Research.
4. In addition to the six large cities, municipalities receiving funds from the Urban Aid program in fiscal year 1980 include Asbury park, Atlantic City, Bayonne, Bloomfield, Bridgeton, East Orange, Hoboken, Irvington, Keansbury, Lakewood Township, Long Branch, Millville, Montclair, Neptune Township, New Brunswick, North Bergen Township, Orange, Passaic, Perth Amboy, Phillipsburg, Plainfield, Rahway, Union City, Vineland, West New York, and West Orange.
5. The municipalities receiving urban aid funds in fiscal year 1984 are mentioned in the subsection of the analysis examining the regional distribution of the black population.
6. All conclusions about black elected officials are gleaned from the annual reports published by the Joint Center for Political Studies in Washington, D C.
7. For a useful examination and delineation of the resources associated with electoral successes among black candidates, see Albert K Karnig and Susan Welch, Black Representation and Urban Policy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), especially pp 17-107.
8. An excellent overview of the related political and economic considerations are found in Michael B Preston, Leneal J Henderson, Jr. and Paul Puryear, ed., The New Black Politics: The Search for Political Power (New York: Longman Inc , 1982), especially pp. XVII-XX and pp. 47-52; Susan S. Fainstein, Norman I. Fainstein, Richard Child Hill, Dennis Judd and Michael Peterson Smith, ed , Restructuring the City: The Political Economy of Urban Redevelopment (New York: Longman, Inc , 1983 , especially Chapters I and VII and Joint Center for Political Studies, A Policy Framework for Racial Justice (Washington, D.C The Authors, 1983).

## HOUSING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BLACKS: ACCESS TO THE SUBURBS

Lee Porter

Mt. Laurel II, one of the most significant land use cases in history, requires municipalities in New Jersey to provide for construction of low and moderate income housing. This decision, however, may have little positive impact on the state's low and moderate income black residents if concerned blacks fail to participate in the formulation of state and local government policies implementing this broad, important mandate.

### BACKGROUND

Blacks were excluded from the housing boom of the last 1940's and 1950's in America solely on the basis of race. To this date Black families have yet to recover from this exclusion. White families, on the other hand, benefitted handsomely from post World War II housing proliferation. Subsidized by Government, the suburban Levittowns of this nation provided new, decent, moderately priced housing which was largely denied to blacks. These houses were considerably cheaper than the rental apartments available to blacks in congested areas where substandard housing was fast becoming the norm. This reality of black

---

Lee Porter is the Executive Director of the Fair Housing Council of Northern New Jersey.

housing conditions has changed little over time. Today, 60 percent of black families in New Jersey are renters and most are concentrated in the state's central cities.

Over the years, those low cost suburban dwellings available to New Jersey's white residents have appreciated tremendously in value. This phenomenon has enabled those families to sell at a substantial profit and to use this return on their investment to purchase more expensive housing. The Mt. Laurel II decision is an implicit recognition of this historical pattern of racial discrimination in housing and a call for new state and local policies to put a halt to it.

## ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LAWS

The United States has had laws prohibiting racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing since 1866. Federal legislation, Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, was enacted to eliminate discrimination in housing based upon race, creed, color and national origin.

Long before the progressive state of New York (and the rest of the nation, one might add) passed Fair Housing laws, New Jersey had already established itself as a leader in this area. As early as 1954 a law prohibiting discrimination in public housing and some privately financed housing was enacted in this state. Additional laws, strengthening the 1954 law, were enacted in 1957 and 1961. Although these laws were positive state level responses to a serious social inequity, they had marginal effect. A 1964 study prepared by students at the Rutgers Law School in Newark reported that the increase in the number of Negroes in

New Jersey cities was not being accompanied by an increase in available adequate housing. The student's report, prepared under the direction of Professor Alfred W. Blumrosen, further maintained that,

Nearly 50 percent of non-whites living in the cities live in substandard housing as measured by the (1960) census figures. In Trenton, 38 percent of non-whites live in deteriorated or dilapidated buildings. In Newark, the figure was 52 percent in 1960. While 8.7 percent of the state's population is non-white, they occupy only 7.5 percent of all housing units; of these only 10 percent were built during the 1950-1960 period, the remaining 90 percent being older.

When the study cited above was conducted, only a handful of blacks resided in New Jersey suburbs. Almost 20 years later, black suburbanization is just beginning to take shape in our state.

## OPENING THE DOOR TO NEW JERSEY'S SUBURBS

The Fair Housing Council of Northern New Jersey has been in existence more than two decades. In addition to providing comprehensive housing counseling and general housing services, the Council receives housing discrimination complaints every day. It is the largest single source of complaint referral to the New Jersey Division of Civil Rights. Anywhere from 25 to 55 complaints per year are referred to the Division, not to mention a constant caseload of 8 to 15 complaints which the Council's staff attorney files in State Court or U.S. District Court.

In northern New Jersey, many homes and apartments are offered for sale or rent every day. To many of our citizens, access to these residences is denied, not because they have objectionable characters or are without good jobs but solely because of their race, color, sex, national origin, religion, marital status, age or handicap.

The Fair Housing Council of Northern New Jersey was formed in the belief that housing discrimination is inconsistent with the American principle of respect for the rights and dignity of all people. Housing discrimination is also illegal as clearly stated in State and Federal law.

Despite this explicit legislation, discrimination continues. The work of the Fair Housing Council is essential until the barriers to open housing are lifted and every person has equal opportunity to rent or buy the apartment or house of his/her choice.

During 1982, the New Jersey Division on Civil Rights received approximately 77 complaints of alleged housing discrimination from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Division's total annual caseload of housing discrimination complaints hovers around 100 cases. Many knowledgeable housing counselors regard this low number of cases as a reflection of non-reporting of incidents by minorities for reasons of personal embarrassment, a sense of helplessness and/or ignorance of the law. Invariably, when successful fair housing litigation is reported in the news media, a virtual stress of calls for assistance is received by the Fair Housing Council of Northern New Jersey. The callers tell of having experienced an incident similar to that about which the press reported but that they did not know where to go for assistance or what kind of assistance to seek.

## ENFORCEMENT OF FAIR HOUSING LAWS

One is not likely to find a fair housing practitioner or fair housing advocate who maintains that enforcement of the housing anti-discrimination laws by municipalities, the State, or the federal government is adequate. Frequently it is felt that lack of enforcement is tantamount to no law at all. The Reagan Administration and Senators Edward Kennedy and Robert Mathias have recently introduced separate bills designed to strengthen federal Fair Housing enforcement. Without strict enforcement of such laws, with severe penalties for violators, blacks and other minorities will continue to face exclusion and will continue to pay a high and unreasonable economic and emotional price as they attempt to realize their housing needs.

## IS MOUNT LAUREL II THE ANSWER?

The suburban population of blacks in Bergen County (where the Northern New Jersey Fair Housing Council has focused its attention) is low -- less than 5 percent -- and reflective of the low black suburban population throughout the State. Most of the Black population in Bergen County is concentrated in only 3 of the 70 Bergen municipalities.

Even today, and yes, in New Jersey, blacks can expect to experience both blatant and subtle forms of housing discrimination. At one extreme is the outright denial of housing solely on the basis of skin color, at the other extreme is the practice whereby realtors steer blacks to areas where other blacks have been permitted to secure housing but fail to show them housing in all white neighborhoods.



Blacks who do not want to live in the suburbs certainly should explore ways to parlay Mt. Laurel II with programs like the Urban Development Action Grants (UDAG) and the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) to improve housing conditions in New Jersey's towns and cities. Much should and can be done to increase and upgrade our stock of housing in urban areas.

Actually, it is too soon to determine how Mt. Laurel II will be implemented. At this moment, we do know that there is a desperate need for moderate cost housing for all races and ethnic groups. It is obvious builders want to build, bankers want to lend, insurers want to insure, and suppliers of housing software wish to supply. Blacks ought to seek out and work with agencies and organizations opposed to discrimination in housing and employment.

The time is right for coalition building among socially progressive groups on behalf of low and moderate income blacks in need of housing. I believe builders are waiting to be asked to participate and cooperate with people wishing to sponsor housing development programs. We should seize the moment.

## A COMMUNITY REMEMBERS

Regina Waynes Joseph

Often, in the fevered discussions of a political debate or, in this instance, a landmark legal decision, the people around whom the debate or decision is centered can get lost in the process. The story of Mount Laurel II is more than the story of a landmark legal decision, it is also the story of black communities in Burlington County, New Jersey that are little known, rarely discussed and that have a long history of residency there. Recounted here are some reminiscences of people who live in two towns -- Moorestown and Mount Laurel -- their views of the black community in these towns and how they came to be there. There has been no attempt to select a scientific sample or cross section of individuals but an effort has been made to present a balanced view. First, some history.

---

Regina Waynes Joseph holds an M.A. from Teacher's College, Columbia University, and is Associate Director of the Business Employment Foundation, Inc. in Paterson, New Jersey.

## MOORESTOWN

According to a publication of the Historical Society of Moorestown, "Moorestown did not start to develop as a village much before 1700 ." and "(1)ts growth during the first one hundred years was exceedingly slow "1 Then, as now, it appeared to be a very gracious community known for its stately homes and wide, tree lined streets A quiet town, Moorestown has never been an industrial center but rather "a town of homes."2

During the 1700's, it is evident that, though a predominantly Quaker community, the holding of slaves was not uncommon in Moorestown 3 However, the institution of slavery was not a comfortable fact for this community In fact, John Woolman, a Quaker and tailor from Mount Holly, who Dr Clement A Price characterizes as " ..an apostle of racial justice at a time when most whites were indifferent to the idea . "4 was felt to be a regular preacher at the Moorestown Friends Meeting House Thus, as with most black communities in the United States, the black community in Moorestown had its roots in slavery.

Slavery in New Jersey was abolished by the legislature in 1846.

Dr. Ernest Lyght further notes:

For all practical purposes slavery in Burlington County was almost extinct by 1840, for the census of that year registered one "negress" held at Chesterfield. Slavery never gained a sound footing in Burlington County In addition to the Quaker presence, the soil did not lend itself to slave labor in that it was not as profitable as in other areas of the State."

One prominent white resident of Moorestown commenting on the history of the black community there noted that " . the white community was very wealthy and most had house servants. .they built homes for

their servants in Moorestown..." A resident of Mount Laurel concurred stating that "... around those times, blacks mainly worked in the homes, as household workers, or on the farms in the area..."

As has often been the case, the black church is known for shedding light on history. In this instance, records show the founding of two black churches in Moorestown in the late nineteenth century -- the Bethel A.M.E. Church in 1879 and the Second Baptist Church in 1897. Both were founded with the support of local white citizenry. An interesting footnote is mentioned about the founders of the Bethel A.M.E. Church by Dr. Lyght, "The pioneers had previously been members of Jacob's Chapel A M E in Mount Laurel, but they began to grow weary of the long, round trip walk each Sunday" Moorestown and Her Neighbors, first published in 1929, records the membership of the Bethel A M E. Church at the time as 223 and that of the Second Baptist Church as 240 <sup>7</sup>

In the present day, blacks are dispersed throughout the town though as Congressman Edwin B Forsythe (R-6th District) admits " primarily in two concentrations." The two concentrations to which he refers are both north of the railroad which divides the town into two major sections. One concentration is on Beech Street which is located on the east side of the center of Moorestown. It is here that the Second Baptist Church, referenced earlier, is found. The majority of Moorestown's poor black community lives on Beech Street. Up until the last few years, most of the homes in this area were dilapidated shacks, "...a blight on the community" noted Forsythe. Several years ago, a community coalition of churches finally took responsibility for rehabilitating this area, formed the Moorestown Ecumenical Neighborhood

Development Corporation, gutted Beech Street, replacing there decent, safe and sanitary housing.

The second concentration of the black community is on the west side of the center of town bordered primarily by the railroad to the south, and Flynn Avenue and New Albany Road to the north. Most of Moorestown's middle income blacks reside on these streets. One major development, Farmdale Road, which is said to have increased the number of middle class blacks moving to Moorestown and encouraged future such developments, had a curious beginning. The story was first mentioned to me by my father, William D. Waynes, a resident of Farmdale Road since 1964. He stated that the Farmdale Road development was built by Blase A. Ravikio, a prominent white builder/developer in Moorestown, at the behest of RCA for their black engineering talent who could not buy homes in comfortable communities in the area. At that time, my father continued, blacks could not purchase homes anywhere in Moorestown because of the housing discrimination which existed. In fact, he said, restrictive covenants denying purchase of homes to blacks and Jews were still to be found at that time in many deeds in this and other surrounding communities.

A talk with Blase A. Ravikio elaborated on the story my father had shared with me. Ravikio recalled that in late 1958 or 1959 (he was uncertain of the exact date), he received a call from a personnel manager with the Radio Corporation of America (RCA). RCA had a major facility in Moorestown and had many defense contracts. The personnel manager told him that he had a number of black engineers on staff that he was losing because they could find no housing in the area. Ravikio

was asked to help. Ravikio stated that he did not know how he could assist but that he would attend a meeting with the 18 black engineers at the Camden YMCA. After that meeting, Ravikio recalled, he was determined to build homes for these men and their families. The engineers had shared with him the blighted, impoverished conditions in which they lived in Philadelphia, Camden and other communities in South Jersey to which blacks were directed to live. Ravikio proceeded to look for a municipality in which he could build the proposed homes. He approached several municipalities in Burlington County and all refused for various reasons, not the least of which being that the homes to be built were intended for black families. He thought that the project would be impossible to complete but one day discussed the problem with then Moorestown Mayor Edwin B. Forsythe. Ravikio recalled that Forsythe said why not Moorestown? Ravikio indicated that he had not thought of Moorestown before because he felt that housing would have been too expensive to build there and thus, more than the black engineers could afford. But Forsythe told him that the town owned a tract of land on North Church Street that could be sold for the project. Ravikio purchased that land and assembled additional parcels adjacent to it and planned to build 18-21 homes. Prior to municipal approval, a public hearing of the Planning Board was held before which the 18 men appeared. The project was approved and the Farmdale Road development built. Blacks started moving into the development in 1959.

W. Edward Armstead, a resident of Farmdale Road, upon hearing the Ravikio story, said, "I was one of the 18." Armstead added to the story. He said that in 1958 or 1959 he received a call from Taber

Bolden, a black personnel manager in RCA's Camden facility. He was told of the planned project for Moorestown and was invited to meet with Ravikio in Camden. Armstead said that he went only because he did not want to break the unity of the group but actually had no intention of buying a new home since he had just purchased a home in Lawnside, New Jersey, six months earlier. He recalled that the plans proceeded well and finally reached the point when the 18 men were to draw numbers to determine in what order lots would be selected. Armstead drew his number which turned out to be number one. He had the first choice. He and his wife, Shirley, decided to move to Moorestown and moved there in March of 1960.

Upon reflecting on his decision some 23 years ago, Armstead said that he was not dissatisfied. He said that some years ago he resented the fact that he could not move anywhere he wanted in Moorestown but the times had changed somewhat. Blacks were, in fact, now dotted throughout the community and the quality of life had been and was rather good for him and his family. He said that he preferred living in the black community and noted that this neighborhood did not experience the crime that the rest of Moorestown was undergoing. This was due, in part, to the fact that, since the neighborhood was all black, it was easier to spot white youngsters who were engaged in petty crime. Armstead said the neighbors could, if this occurred, pick them up and turn them over to their families and/or police. Armstead further commented that, prior to the Farmdale development, the middle class black community was not large, consisting mainly of some teachers and a few principals. Subsequent to 1960, more middle income blacks bought lots and built

their own homes, but still, mainly in this concentration. Armstead commented finally that it was not until " . definitely 1970 . " that blacks could move anywhere they chose in Moorestown. W. Edward Armstead is currently President of the Moorestown Board of Education on which Board he has served since 1967.

The 1980 census figures show Moorestown's total population as 15,596 with 919 black residents or 5.9 percent of the total population.\*

## MOUNT LAUREL

On March 7, 1872, a new township was " . set off from the township of Evesham in the county of Burlington to be called the township of Mount Laurel." But the history of Mount Laurel extends further back than 1872 and much of it tells the story of the presence of a significant black community. That story can best be told by telling the story of one woman, Ethel Lawrence, whose family has lived in Mount Laurel since before the Civil War.

As was noted earlier in the discussion of Moorestown, slavery was not uncommon. This was no less true for Mount Laurel. Mount Laurel A Centennial History concurs:

The Civil War and the Industrial Revolution played minimal roles in the history of Mount Laurel. Although the Quakers were to profess a religious indignation toward the institution of slavery, some of New Jersey's earliest settlers found they were economically forced to separate livelihood from morality (underlining mine). Slaves purchased in Newark, Delaware and Baltimore, Maryland were imported to work as field hands and household servants.<sup>16</sup>

Dr. Ernest Lyght compiled a sampling of slave manumissions in Burlington County effected during the period 1786-1800. Of those 24



listed from Deed Book A, 11 slaves were freed in Evesham Township.<sup>11</sup> A look at the census data of the mid-nineteenth century further provides a sense of the size of the black community. The census data of 1830 records 46 black households in Evesham Township with a total of 194 persons living in those households. The 1840 census figures report a "total (white and free)" population of 5,060; 355 free and no slaves reported. Census records of 1861 show a total population of 3,144 with 2,861 white and 284 black.<sup>12</sup>

It was around this time, the middle of the nineteenth century, that reference is first made to Ethel Lawrence's family.

It was Petersburg, located between the foot of the Mount and the junction of the Moorestown-Mount Laurel and Union Mill Roads to the south, that was the final destination of Mary Robinson's great grandparents following their escape as slaves from Delaware. And this is where her grandfather, David A Gaines and her great uncle, George Gaines, were raised.<sup>13</sup>

Mary Robinson, the mother of Ethel Lawrence, still lives in Mount Laurel. The village of Petersburg, mentioned above, was one of several villages which were a part of Evesham Township.

Ethel Lawrence was born in 1926 and raised in Mount Laurel. She recalled her early years there as poor ones during which she attended segregated schools for her elementary education. Upon graduation from eighth grade in 1939, she and the other black youngsters in Mount Laurel attended the same high school as the white students since there were no segregated high schools in the area.

Mrs. Lawrence described Mount Laurel then as "...all farmland..." with most blacks living there as tenant farmers. She remembered vividly working on the farms as a child along with white farming families. But, she noted, though blacks always knew "their place", they were treated

with dignity and respect by the white members of the community. Black and white children played together, her mother, Mrs. Mary Robinson served as Brownie leader of an integrated troop of little girls and all were involved in civic activities.

The "big change..." in race relations came, according to Mrs. Lawrence, with Ramblewood, a middle income development. This area which previously was a fruit farm now housed mainly white residents, characterized by Mrs. Lawrence as "transient people.", many of whom worked for RCA, lived there five to six years, with their major concern -- 'how much can I sell the house for?' From her perspective, these residents "...brought their crime with them, snobbishness and fear". The 'change' included black children who began to be harassed with stones thrown at them, white children, previously members of the integrated Brownie troop, told they could no longer belong, and parents who had "...a lack of manners and respect.". The police, said Mrs. Lawrence, were active participants in the harassment of black children in Mount Laurel.

With Ramblewood came other residential developments and a boom as well in industrial and commercial building. Middle income blacks were always dotted throughout these developments with professionals, sports and television personalities among them. Mrs. Lawrence noted that she knew several of these residents since her brother Dave Lawrence was a prominent football player.

While Mount Laurel was booming, efforts were being made to assist low income, poor communities as well. To this end, the Mount Laurel Community Action Program, which was an offshoot of the Burlington County

agency, formed the Springville Action Committee to provide a variety of assistance, including social services and housing to this "blighted area" of Mount Laurel. Mrs. Lawrence described the Springville area as originally a Jewish summer community prior to World War II when Fort Dix was in its heyday. These summer residents raised chickens on their properties and during the late 1940's, early 1950's, when the properties were abandoned, the chicken houses were converted into apartments where poor blacks, whites and some Puerto Ricans lived. Mrs. Lawrence recalled that as late as fourteen years ago her daughter lived in one of those apartments which one could still tell had been a chicken house. She said the conditions there were very bad to the extent that "...raw sewage came up into the backyards, sometimes into the bathtubs. .".

It was to correct these and similar conditions that the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs supplied a seed grant to the Mount Laurel Community Action Program to build low income housing on Hartford Road in Springville. The Mount Laurel Planning Board turned the project down. Outraged, nine private citizens, including Mrs. Lawrence, sought legal counsel to determine if they could sue Mount Laurel Township and its Planning Board. In a strictly economic suit, the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled in 1975, in what is now known as the Mount Laurel I decision, that the township discriminated through its local zoning ordinances against poor and low income people.

Mount Laurel did not comply with the spirit, much less the letter, of this decision. In fact, around 1979 or 1980, Mrs. Lawrence recalls, Mount Laurel attempted to rezone the area in which she lived into an industrial zone. A petition was gathered with the signatures of all the

black and white residents in this area and presented at the planning board meeting which was attended by all the petitioners. The President of the Mount Laurel Planning Board, a Mr. Campbell, told Mrs. Lawrence that he did not believe the signatures were authentic and wanted them notarized though all the petitioners were in the meeting room at the time. But Mayor Traino interceded at this point and said that he believed the signatures to be authentic and noted that he knew that these residents had lived there for generations. The industrial rezoning was defeated.

Mrs. Lawrence seemed resigned but resolute about what is a constant battle for her and others in Mount Laurel. She said, though her family is poor, they are educated and not asking for a handout. (Mrs. Lawrence attended Burlington County College, Glassboro State and Bank Street Colleges concentrating in early childhood education.) A resident of Ramblewood wrote her a letter asking her if people got together and bought her a house and paid the taxes, would she be happy? This is clearly not the point for Mrs. Lawrence and others who merely wish the right to have decent, safe and affordable housing built in which to live in the communities in which they have always lived.

The 1980 census figures show Mount Laurel's total population as 17,614 with 806 black residents or 4.6 percent of the total population.<sup>1a</sup>

## SOME FINAL THOUGHTS

Are Moorestown's zoning ordinances as restrictive as Mount Laurel's? Armstead and Carl S. Bisgaier, Esq. say they're worse. Congressman Forsythe, upon hearing these comments, said, "I suspect that's a fair statement." But what of the Moorestown Ecumenical Neighborhood Development Corporation's efforts, particularly, the Beech Street project? Bisgaier commented "...what was that -- 13 units?" One problem with Moorestown, he felt, is that since it is such an attractive community, land acquisition is highly competitive, thus difficult for developers interested in pursuing low income projects without municipal support. Congressman Forsythe, a Moorestown resident, noted another problem -- that of the historic unwillingness of the town council in Moorestown to confront the issue. He stated, "...Mount Laurel II has not produced any real movement in Moorestown..." but because of the push by the community coalition of churches, he "...think(s) there's a move now to provide for public housing..." among town council members.

Some have said that the Mount Laurel lawsuit was one manufactured by the attorneys, that, in fact, the attorneys went searching for plaintiffs, selected Mount Laurel as the sample township and having identified the ideal plaintiffs, persuaded them to litigate. I posed these thoughts to Carl S. Bisgaier, Chief Counsel for the Mount Laurel plaintiffs, former Director of the Division of Public Interest Advocacy, now in private practice in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, who along with Kenneth E. Meiser and Peter J. O'Connor, litigated the case. Bisgaier stated that this was not the case, that Ethel Lawrence and the other

eight plaintiffs brought their case to the attorneys after the Mount Laurel Planning Board rejected their request to build low income housing on Hartford Road. Bisgaier further noted that a popular rumor as well was that Mrs. Lawrence and the other individual plaintiffs were recent residents of Mount Laurel. The exact opposite was true. He felt that it was precisely because Mrs. Lawrence had lived there all her life, that her ancestors dated back to the pre-Civil War era in Mount Laurel and that they had been, or so they thought, an integral part of community life in Mount Laurel for so many years that she was determined to sue the township and pursue the case until its end. Bisgaier said he thought the plaintiffs had never expected to be turned down by the Planning Board, that they were "genuinely shocked." It was his view that " . in 1968, it was the first time they realized they were a minority...."

## Footnotes

- 1 George De Cou, Moorestown and Her Neighbors, (Moorestown, N J . Historical Society of Moorestown, 1973), p. 13.
2. Ibid., p. 17.
- 3 Ibid., p. 16.
- 4 Clement Alexander Price, Freedom Not Far Distant A Documentary History of Afro-Americans in New Jersey (Newark, N.J.: New Jersey Historical Society, 1980) p. 21.
5. Ernest Lyght, Path of Freedom, The Black Presence in New Jersey's Burlington County 1659-1900, (Cherry Hill, N.J E & E Publishing House, 1978), p. 25.
6. Ibid , p 72
- 7 DeCou, op.cit., pp. 61, 63
- 8 State Data Center, New Jersey 1980 Census Counts of Population by Race and Spanish Origin, (Trenton, N.J.: New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, 1981), p. 8.
9. Barbara Picken and Gail Greenberg, Mount Laurel: A Centennial History (Mount Laurel, 1972), frontispiece.
10. Ibid., p. 22.
- 11 Lyght, op. cit., pp. 31-32
12. Ibid., p. 47
13. Picken, op. cit., p. 19
- 14 State Data Center, op. cit. p. 8.

## Bibliography

- DeCou, George, Moorestown and Her Neighbors. Moorestown, N J  
Historical Society of Moorestown, 1973.
- Lyght, Ernest, Path of Freedom, The Black Presence in New Jersey's  
Burlington County 1659-1900 Cherry Hill, N.J.: E & E Publishing  
House, 1978.
- Picken, Barbara and Gail Greenberg, Mount Laurel: A Centennial History.  
Mount Laurel, 1972.
- Price, Clement A., Freedom Not Far Distant - A Documentary History of  
Afro-Americans in New Jersey. Newark. New Jersey Historical  
Society, 1980.
- Southern Burlington County N.A.A.C.P., et al., v. Township of Mount  
Laurel, 92 N.J. 158.
- State Data Center, New Jersey 1980 Census Counts of Population by Race  
and Spanish Origins Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey Department  
of Labor and Industry, 1981.



## ORAL INTERVIEWS

Armstead, W. Edward, Telephone Interview, Moorestown, N J , August 4, 1983.

Bisgaier, Carl S., Esq , Telephone Interview, Cherry Hill, N J , August 4, 1983

Forsythe, The Honorable Edwin B , Telephone Interview, Washington, D C., August 4, 1983

Lawrence, Ethel, Telephone Interview, Mount Laurel, N.J , August 3, 1983.

Meiser, Kenneth E., Esq , Telephone Interview, Trenton, N J., August 8, 1983.

Ravikio, Blase A , Telephone Interview, Moorestown, N J., August 2, 1983.

Waynes, William D , Telephone Interview, Moorestown, N J., August 2, 1983.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the following persons for their identification of resources, both individuals and materials, and their patient forbearance as I researched and wrote this article: Philip Thomas, President of the Carter G Woodson Foundation; Giles Wright and Bob Craig of the New Jersey Historical Commission, Rev Dr. Ernest S. Lyght, St Mark's United Methodist Church, Robert Blackwell of the Newark Public Library; and particularly, Robert Holmes, Executive Director, Newark Watershed Conservation and Development Corporation; and Dr. Bruce Ransom, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Rutgers University.

R.W J.

## CRITICAL ISSUES FOR BLACKS

Mount Laurel II does indeed offer real opportunities for addressing the shortage of decent, affordable housing for New Jersey's poor and of particular concern to us, its minority poor. However, the State Supreme Court acknowledges that it cannot build houses, it can only direct that they be built. Farther, the Court cannot guarantee that poor minorities will benefit from new construction in proportion to their needs, it can only encourage communities to be sensitive to such needs. These are important considerations and should be faced squarely by the black community and its supporters.

There are, however, several other issues, some of which have been addressed in these pages, that require our attention as well. The debate within New Jersey about how best to advance the intent of Mount Laurel II will continue for some time. Concerned and informed blacks and other minorities should participate actively in this debate. The issues that follow seem sufficiently important to warrant being raised by us in that context.

## LOW INCOME HOUSING REQUIRES PUBLIC SUBSIDY

There seems to be general agreement within the state that the construction of moderate income housing is economically feasible. The consensus regarding low income housing is that its economic feasibility is questionable.

It is felt that to construct moderate income housing is possible through the use of incentives that impose limited or no burden on local governments. One such incentive is to modify local density requirements, thereby allowing the construction of more units on a parcel of land than the zoning ordinance stipulates. This incentive is often sufficient to make a project attractive to a developer. Where low income housing is at issue this type of subsidy is simply inadequate.

As a result, the prevailing view is that low income housing cannot be built without a deep public subsidy. The Court acknowledged this perception in its decision and suggested that municipalities might be required to offer tax abatements as an incentive. In addition it suggested that municipalities seek state and federal housing subsidies as well.

This, unfortunately, is a period during which federal and state subsidy programs are being scaled back or eliminated. Accordingly, not much help is likely to be obtained from these sources. There does exist one interesting possibility that could be pursued, however. The federal Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG) which generally does not provide funds for new housing construction, will permit, with specific authorization from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, neighborhood based, non-profit organizations or local

development corporations to use CDBG funds to subsidize new housing construction.

In the absence of strong public demand for government support for low income housing, little will be constructed.

## PLANNING TAKES CENTER STAGE

The Court designated the State Development Guide Plan as the document to be used in determining where low and moderate income housing should be constructed. The Guide Plan, until now, had been virtually ignored as a tool in local land use decision-making. Indeed, few state agencies have seen the need to treat it with anything more than passing interest. The Court decision changes all of this. "The State Development Guide Plan," the Court said, "provides a statewide blueprint for future development."

The Plan divides the state into six basic areas: growth, limited growth, agriculture, conservation, pinelands and coastal zones. Mount Laurel II says agricultural, conservation, pinelands and limited growth communities will have to provide low- and moderate- income housing only for the poor within their borders. Those municipalities in growth areas must provide for their own poor and a fair share of the region's poor outside their municipal boundaries.

Given the weight now attributed to the Guide Plan, it is appropriate that it receive more deliberate attention. It is in need of updating and refinement if it is to be the effective tool in land management decision-making envisioned by the Court. However, it is not the issue on which Mount Laurel II focuses -- that issue is the

construction of housing which is affordable to poor people. Yet, there is a distinct possibility that the major outcome of Mount Laurel II will be the creation in New Jersey of a regional or statewide planning process.

For many New Jerseyans who hailed the decision as forward looking and responsive to a serious need in the state, the shift in focus from housing construction to planning process has not been unwelcome. Their argument is that absent a more rational process by which local development takes place, New Jersey's growth will continue to be chaotic. A coordinated regional or statewide system of local land use planning is a dire need. Creating one would allow for sensible development decision-making, benefiting everyone in the state. In the discussion of this issue, however, low income housing tends to get raised as an afterthought.

Because the push in support of a planning process as the central focus of Mount Laurel II is supported by environmental, agricultural, and the planning profession communities, it has already preempted the weak efforts of low and moderate income housing advocates in the Mount Laurel II debate. The issue that must be addressed is whether those who advance the planning process theme can be enlisted to further the housing theme as well. It is a challenge that we must accept since many in the former group have traditionally allied themselves with organizations committed to issues of equal opportunity.

## CREAMING AND DISPERSAL

Successful implementation of the directives in Mount Laurel II, it has been suggested, may bode ill for blacks in New Jersey. Two issues have been raised as cause for concern in this regard. It should be pointed out that the concern expressed stems not from informed members of the black community, but from individuals who feel blacks may not perceive the imminent danger.

The first issue about which it is suggested blacks should concern themselves, is the probable "creaming effect" of successful implementation of Mount Laurel II. This argument is that enhanced housing opportunities for blacks outside of central cities will result in socially and economically motivated blacks abandoning the cities for the suburbs. Left behind will be those individuals least able to contribute to urban revitalization. Consequently, Mount Laurel II could produce the unintended result of further retarding urban redevelopment and thereby exacerbate the problems faced by those blacks and other minorities remaining in them.

This argument is the height of disingenuousness. The simple fact of American life is that every opportunity presented to improve one's life condition should be pursued. To suggest that exercising the option to secure decent, affordable housing outside the city is ill advised because the city would be the poorer for it is insulting. The solution to urban decline is not to be found in keeping the poor in declining cities, but rather by making it possible for the poor to maximize opportunities to improve their life condition wherever possible.

The second argument is that Mount Laurel II will result in black dispersal, such that the political clout blacks now have as a consequence of being concentrated in urban areas, will be lost. Bruce Ransom has addressed this issue thoroughly in the body of this report. His conclusion is that as far as New Jersey's landscape is concerned, this is a non-issue. He maintains that black deconcentration can and probably will have positive political effects. Dispersal will allow blacks to participate on a broader basis in state and regional politics. Increasing the numbers of blacks in New Jersey's outlying areas will benefit blacks and it will benefit New Jersey.



NJ R 305.8960749 B567 1183  
Blacks in New Jersey.  
MAIN  
33173010641427

## DATE DUE

|         |  |  |                   |
|---------|--|--|-------------------|
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
| GAYLORD |  |  | PRINTED IN U.S.A. |

NJ R 305.8960749 B567 1783  
Blacks in New Jersey.  
MAIN  
33173010641427

## DATE DUE

|         |  |  |                   |
|---------|--|--|-------------------|
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
|         |  |  |                   |
| GAYLORD |  |  | PRINTED IN U.S.A. |

THE NEWARK PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 3173 01064 1427

NJ R  
305.896  
0749  
B567  
1983